DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 656 JC 770 469

AUTHOR	Duerr, Bradly; Bell, Robert
TITLE	Faculty Utilization by the Community Colleges; A Report to the Washington State Legislature. Performance Audit No. 76-10.
INSTITUTION	Washington State Legislature, Olympia. Legislative Budget Committee.
PUB DATE	Jan 77
NOTE	50p.; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Teachers; Community Colleges; *Efficiency; Faculty Workload; *Junior Colleges; Resource Allocations; *Staff Utilization; State School District Relationship; *Statewide Planning; Teacher Qualifications; Teacher Salaries; *Teaching Load; Tenure
IDENTIFIERS	*Teacher Utilization; Washington State Community College System

ABSTRACT

To determine if the faculty of the Washington State Community College System were being efficiently and effectively utilized, a Legislative Budget Committee auditor selected six community colleges for a detailed review. Data selected for review were (1) individual faculty teaching loads and (2) course offerings. The auditor concluded that faculty teaching loads during 1974-75 were commensurate with those determined by union contracts, and that, if the contracts did not specify teaching load, the loads were reasonable when compared to those at colleges that did have specific teaching load standards. He also concluded that the number of course sections that could have been eliminated due to lack of student enrollment during 1974-75 was minimal. The report sets forth the qualifications for personnel, the tenure policy, and average base salaries by district and college; describes the system-level planning and review functions as they relate to utilization of faculty; and makes recommendations for improving the System's planning and review process. It also recommends that the legislature continue to include in the appropriation bill a proviso that limits the number of FTE faculty that can be employed within the System. (DC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED144656

STATE OF WASHINGTON

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET COMMITTEE

INSURANCE BUILDING

OLYMPIA

98504

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas Hazzard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERFORMANCE AUDIT

JC 770 469

A Report to the
WASHINGTON STATE LEGISLATURE

FOREWORD

This performance audit on the Faculty Utilization by the Washington State Community College System was conducted under legislative authority set forth in RCW 44.28.085 and RCW 44.28.086, which state in part:

> *The Legislative Budget Committee shall make management surveys and program reviews as to every public body, officer or employees subject to the provisions of RCW 43.09-.290 through 43.09.340. The Legislative Budget Committee may also make management surveys and program reviews of local school districts, intermediate school districts, and other units of local government receiving state funds as grants-in-aid or as shared revenues. Management surveys for the purpose of this section shall be an independent examination for the purpose of providing the Legislature with an evaluation and report of the manner in which any public agency, officer, administrator, or employee has discharged the responsibility to faithfully, efficiently and effectively administer any legislative purpose of the State. Program review for the purpose of this section shall be an examination of State or local government programs to ascertain whether or not such programs continue to serve their intended purposes, are conducted in an efficient and effective manner, or require modification or elimination: ...*
>
> *The Legislative Budget Committee authority for management surveys contained in RCW 44.28.085 shall include reviews of program goals and objectives of public bodies, officers or employees to determine conformity with legislative intent and shall include comprehensive performance audits to ensure that agency programs are being conducted in accordance with legislative intent and program goals and objectives.*

This performance audit conducted by the Legislative Budget Committee is concerned in particular with the management practices that are employed within the Community College System to obtain the efficient and effective utilization of its faculty resource. Specifically, the audit examines: (1) how the system plans for the efficient and effective utilization of its faculty resource (management planning function); and (2) the system's degree of success in implementing and controlling the process of accomplishment of its planned faculty utilization (management operations function).

With the full understanding that legislators by the very nature of their job must read and absorb facts from large volumes of written material, the Legislative Auditor has attempted to compile this report in a manner that will permit every legislator to obtain the maximum understanding of the content of this audit report consistent with his available time and the depth of his interest in this particular audit subject.

First of all, consistent with generally accepted management practices, this is an exception report. The report highlights those items that are in need of improvement because they are being performed inefficiently, ineffectively or uneconomically, or are entirely out of control, redundant or no longer need to be performed in line with providing citizens of the State needed and essential services. For obvious, practical reasons this report does not highlight all of the positive things the agency has done or is doing but focuses its attention on the needed improvements.

Readers of this report can obtain an understanding of the scope of the audit by reading Section I titled "Scope and Objectives." (YELLOW PAGE)

To obtain the essence of the conclusions reached by the auditor with a minimum of reading, turn to Section II, "Summary." (YELLOW PAGES)

Appendix I, "Summary of Recommendations", of the report includes in one place all of the changes recommended by the audit based on the factual data gathered during the audit. (GREEN PAGES)

Section III, "Findings-Analysis-Recommendations", provides detailed data regarding the auditor's findings and provides the rationale that lead to the auditor's conclusions and recommendations. (WHITE PAGES)

Appendix II, "Proposed Legislation", contains the auditor's proposals regarding the need for new or revised legislation. (YELLOW PAGE)

Appendix III, "Fiscal Impact", of the report is the place that the reader will always find fiscal impact data developed by the auditor. (PINK PAGE)

Additional appendixes are included as necessary to provide a more in-depth look at subject matters discussed in the report, but reading these appendixes is not essential to obtain an understanding of the subject being discussed by the auditor.

The last appendix of the report is reserved for agency comments on the audit report.

For the reader's convenience, a "Table of Contents" can be found on the pages immediately following this "Foreword".

A "management" or a "performance" audit is essentially a systematic and objective appraisal of the quality of management, directed toward determining whether an agency(s) has discharged and is discharging its responsibilities to faithfully, efficiently and effectively administer its designated State programs. The assessment of the quality of management involves the detailed examination and analysis of the three basic management functions -- planning, operations and review. The final product of the audit is an evaluation and report to the Legislature concerning the agency's discharge of responsibilities. Faithfulness refers to whether the programs have been administered in accordance with promises made to the Legislature and the expression of the legislation will (legislative intent). Effectiveness refers to whether planned program objectives are being achieved; efficiency refers to whether program accomplishments are being achieved through utilizing the least costly combination of resources and with a minimum of waste.

In carrying out this performance audit, every attempt was made to be objective. Data used in the audit was gathered, in part, from interviews conducted with the staff of the Community College System. Other data was obtained from various budget requests and operating reports.

This report to the Washington State Legislature has been reviewed and approved by the Legislative Budget Committee after it had heard testimony from the Legislative Auditor and his staff, reviewed written comments submitted by interested agencies regarding the audit and listened to oral testimony both pro and con presented by all parties wishing to be heard on this subject during the public meetings held for that purpose.

All personnel were helpful and cooperative in furnishing the auditor with information needed for the development and completion of this report. The audit was conducted by Bradly Duerr and Robert Bell of the Legislative Budget Committee staff.

THOMAS R. HAZZARD
Legislative Auditor

Authorized for distribution by
the Legislative Budget Committee
January 7, 1977.

Senator Gary M. Odegaard, Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
I	SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES	1
II	SUMMARY	2
III	FINDINGS-ANALYSIS-RECOMMENDATIONS	4
	A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION	4
	1. The Statewide System	4
	2. The State Board	5
	3. Decentralization of Authority	5
	4. Type of Appointments	5
	5. Tenure Policy for System	6
	6. Qualifications for Personnel	7
	7. Salaries	8
	8. Ratio of Full-Time to Part-Time Faculty	11
	B. PLANNING FOR FACULTY UTILIZATION	12
	1. Introduction	12
	2. Legislative Intent	13
	3. Findings	14
	a. Goals and Objectives Relating to Efficient and Effective Instruction Have Been Documented	14
	b. Program Plans Have Been Established	16
	c. Performance Standards Have Not Been Established	16
	d. Organization Structure and Responsibility Assignments Are Decentralized	17

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
	e. Policy and Assignment of Responsibilities Have Not Been Formally Communicated to Local Boards	17
	4. Conclusions	17
	5. Recommendations	19
	RECOMMENDATION 1	19
	RECOMMENDATION 2	19
	RECOMMENDATION 3	20
	RECOMMENDATION 4	20
C.	ACTUAL FACULTY UTILIZATION	21
	1. Faculty Teaching Loads	21
	2. Review of Course Offerings	23
	3. Position Control	23
	4. Recommendation	25
	RECOMMENDATION 5	25
D.	MANAGEMENT REVIEW FUNCTION	26
	1. Introduction	26
	2. Findings	27
	3. Evaluation and Conclusions	27
	4. Recommendation	
	RECOMMENDATION 6	28
APPENDIX I	SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMPLETION DATES	29
APPENDIX II	SUMMARY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION	32

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION		PAGE
APPENDIX III	FISCAL IMPACT	33
APPENDIX IV	AGENCY COMMENTS	34

Exhibits:

Exhibit 1:	Average Base Salaries by District and College - Annually Contracted Professional Personnel - Washington Community Colleges, 1970-1976	9
Exhibit 2:	Annually Contracted Professional Personnel by Base Salary Distribution - Washington Community Colleges - Academic Year 1975-76	10
Exhibit 3:	Full-Time Equivalent Faculty by Employment Status	11
Exhibit 4:	Washington State Community College Student/Faculty Ratios by College by Discipline Category Stated in Full-Time Equivalents For the 1974-75 and 1975-76 Academic Years	25

SECTION I

SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

SCOPE:

The scope of this performance audit was limited to the review of appraisal of how the Washington State Community College System utilizes its faculty as a resource.

OBJECTIVES:

The objectives of the audit were to:

1. ascertain whether the faculty resources are being utilized according to legislative intent;
2. evaluate the planning and executing of systemwide management's use of faculty resources; and
3. determine if the faculty resources are being utilized in an efficient and economical manner.

SECTION II

SUMMARY

The Community College Act of 1967 cited as one of its purposes to provide for an administration that would "encourage efficiency in operation." The Community College System, in recogni ing this statement of legislative intent, established as one of its goals the goal to provide more efficient and effective instruction. This performance audit is concerned with (1) the steps taken by the Community College System to assure that this goal will be achieved, and (2) whether or not the goal is being achieved.

The audit concludes that the systemwide management process has not been developed sufficiently to enable the System to determine on a systemwide basis if the goal to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of instruction is being achieved. Although several aspects of the System's management process were found to be adequate, the System's management review process was found to be deficient.

To determine if the faculty of the Community College System were being utilized effectively, the auditor selected six community colleges for a detailed review. Data selected for review were (1) individual faculty teaching loads and (2) course offerings. The conclusions stemming from these reviews are offered below:

1. The faculty of the six community colleges had assumed,during the 1974-75 academic year, teaching loads commensurate with their appropriate union contracts; or, in those cases where the contracts did not specify teaching loads, the loads were reasonable when compared to those colleges that did have specific workload standards.

2. The number of course sections that could have been eliminated due to lack of student enrollment during the 1974-75 academic year from the six colleges' course offerings were minimal.

The thrust of the report's recommendations is to improve the System's planning and review process. A recommendation is also made to the Legislature to continue the practice of including in the appropriation to the Community College System a proviso that limits the number of FTE faculty that can be employed within the Community College System.

SECTION III

FINDINGS-ANALYSIS-RECOMMENDATIONS

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. The Statewide System

The Community College System of the State of Washington was established by the Community College Act of 1967. This legislation stated that the purposes of the community college education for this State:

> *27B.50.020. Purpose. The purpose of this chapter is to provide for the dramatically increasing number of a part of the continuing higher education program or for occupational training, by creating a new, independent system of community colleges which will:*
>
> *(1) Offer an open door to every citizen, regardless of his background or experience, at a cost normally within his economic means;*
>
> *(2) Ensure that each community college district shall offer thoroughly comprehensive educational, training and service programs to meet the needs of both the communities and students served by combining, with equal emphasis, high standards of excellence in academic transfer courses, realistic and practical courses in occupational education, both graded and ungraded; community services of an educational, cultural, and recreational nature; and adult education;*
>
> *(3) Provide administration by state and local boards which will avoid unnecessary duplication of facilities in operation and creativity and imagination in education, training and service to meet the needs of the community and students;*
>
> *(4) Allow for the growth, improvement, flexibility and modification of the community colleges and their education, training and service programs as future needs occur; and*
>
> *(5) Establish firmly that community colleges are for purposes of academic training, two-year institutions, and are an independent, unique, and vital section of our common school system and other institutions of higher learning, and never to be considered for conversion into four-year liberal arts colleges.*

The entire system was divided into twenty-two administrative districts. (RCW 28B.60.040).

2. The State Board

The State Board for Community College Education is composed of seven members - one for each of the State's congressional districts. (RCW 28B.50.050)

a. General powers: supervision and control over the State System of Community Colleges.

b. Specific powers: includes (among others) the establishment of minimum standards with respect to the qualifications and credentials of instructional and key administrative personnel. (RCW 28B.50-.080[7])

3. Decentralization of Authority

The State Board sets general policies and standards, but the several districts administer their own matters of specific concern. The State Board expects local boards to establish whatever practices and standards best meet the community requirements in the local districts and to publish such practices. (WAC 131-16-070) Therefore, salary levels will vary from district to district and campus to campus.

4. Type of Appointments

Faculty appointments of five types:

a. probationary faculty
b. tenured faculty
c. administrative with probationary faculty
d. administrative with tenured faculty
e. administrative without tenure

5. Tenure Policy for System

a. Legal definition: *"Tenure" shall mean a faculty appointment for an indefinite period of time which may be revoked only for adequate cause and by due process.* (RCW 28B.50.851)

b. The heart of the assessment process lies in the tenure statutes which are encompassed in RCW 28B.50.850 through RCW 28B.50.896. These provisions require the establishment of a process on the local level to fulfill the tenure procedures and involve the use of a tenure review committee for each full-time faculty member. District boards are empowered to make rules implementing these tenure provisions and these rules themselves are negotiable under Chapter 28B.52 RCW.

c. Administrative tenure policies have been articulated by the State Board. These statements are meant to augment the tenure statutes and to be helpful to local colleges as they negotiate and establish local assessment rules.

1) State Board general policy on tenure:

In order to insure effective teaching and professional development of the faculty members of the various community colleges, faculty members should be granted the privilege of retaining their positions after such time as they qualify for appointment under a system of tenure. The tenure system should provide for orderly administrative procedures and due process regarding the granting and revocation of tenure status.

Faculty members who conjointly hold appointments as department heads, division heads, or other administrative officers and who also qualify for tenure shall hold tenure only with respect to their appointments as members of the faculty and not to their appointments to such supervisory or administrative positions. (State Board Policy 2.80.01)

2) Criteria for evaluating reappointment or tenure status:

   a) Job performance (rating by administrators, and possibly peer faculty, students and self);

   b) Educational and occupational training;

   c) Previous occupational and/or educational experiences;

   d) Professional and occupational activities (e.g., membership in profession organizations). (State Board Policy 2.40.01)

3) Guidelines for operations of tenure review committees:

   The written report stating whether or not the probationer should be granted tenure, should at least use the above-stated criteria; should be submitted 30 calendar days before the last day of the winter quarter; and should begin 180 calendar days after services started.

6. Qualifications for Personnel

The State Board has adopted six general standards for community college personnel. Prior to employment of candidates to perform professional services, the district board of trustees shall establish that the candidate possesses:

Exhibit 1

Average Base Salaries by District and College-
Annually Contracted Professional Personnel -
Washington Community Colleges, 1970 - 1976

District & College		1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
1	Peninsula	$11,650	$11,993	$12,295	$13,623	$13,761	$15,153
2	Grays Harbor	12,610	12,952	13,720	15,009	15,202	16,880
3	Olympic	12,322	12,434	13,106	13,900	13,497	14,829
4	Skagit Valley	11,897	11,834	12,334	13,270	13,671	13,474
5	District Total	12,456	12,672	13,053	13,879	13,874	13,967
	Everett	12,670	12,893	13,369	14,232	14,085	14,147
	Edmonds	11,528	11,784	11,471	12,845	13,236	13,526
6	District Total	12,251	12,515	13,094	14,265	14,208	16,025
	Seattle Central	12,230	12,550	13,154	14,336	14,371	16,127
	Seattle North	12,036	12,238	12,992	14,132	14,275	16,071
	Seattle South	13,046	12,965	12,933	14,154	13,296	15,461
7	Shoreline	11,968	12,161	12,658	13,527	13,925	15,193
8	Bellevue	12,343	13,271	13,695	14,653	15,498	16,326
9	Highline	12,064	12,494	12,953	14,160	14,314	15,148
10	Green River	12,587	12,658	13,494	14,815	15,118	16,723
11	Fort Steilacoom	13,143	12,729	13,113	13,977	13,672	14,736
12	District Total	12,039	11,766	12,330	13,045	13,344	14,408
	Centralia	12,039	12,446	12,985	13,805	14,948	15,328
	Oly. Technical	---	9,981	10,489	11,504	11,982	13,826
	Garrett Heyns	---	---	---	---	---	12,833
13	Lower Columbia	12,065	12,168	12,855	13,708	13,704	15,073
14	Clark	11,479	11,598	12,353	13,232	13,801	15,500
15	Wenatchee Valley	11,747	12,284	12,155	13,960	13,810	14,828
16	Yakima Valley	12,421	12,487	12,907	14,640	15,650	16,029
17	District Total	11,821	11,883	12,362	13,402	13,551	15,217
	Spokane	11,106	11,233	11,595	12,673	12,838	14,729
	Spokane Falls	12,515	12,488	13,224	14,292	14,509	15,881
18	Big Bend	11,646	11,952	12,714	13,861	14,046	15,743
19	Columbia Basin	11,800	11,854	12,354	13,604	13,722	14,478
20	Walla Walla	11,045	11,115	11,705	12,406	12,237	12,792
21	Whatcom	---	---	9,225	10,933	---	---
22	Tacoma	13,253	13,367	14,134	15,592	15,855	17,201
	SYSTEM TOTALS	$12,153	$12,330	$12,891	$13,969	$14,150	$15,226

(1) Scholarship or technical skill that represents appropriate study or training in the proposed area of assignments;

(2) Expertise as a practitioner as evidenced by reports of former associates and supervisors;

(3) A demonstrable understanding and acceptance of the role he is to play as a partner in an educational enterprise serving the best interests of the students;

(4) A demonstrable understanding and acceptance of the mission and character of the community college;

(5) The ability to perform his assigned duties in a manner consistent with the goals of the institutions and the community college system; and

(6) Personal characteristics that contribute to his ability to promote the welfare of the students, the institution, and the State of Washington.

7. Salaries

Since salary levels are set by the districts, there is a great deal of variation among the campuses. Exhibit 1, on the following page, examines average base salaries by district and college.

Exhibit 2 shows the distributions of base salaries for the academic year 1975-76:

Exhibit 2

ANNUALLY CONTRACTED PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL BY BASE SALARY DISTRIBUTION
WASHINGTON COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ACADEMIC YEAR 1975-76

BASE SALARY RANGE	N	% OF TOTAL	CUMULATIVE % OF TOTAL
$ 0 - $ 7,999	1	.05%	.05%
8,000 - 8,499	2	.09	.14
8,500 - 8,999	5	.23	.37
9,000 - 9,499	7	.32	.69
9,500 - 9,999	6	.27	.96
10,000 - 10,499	31	1.40	2.36
10,500 - 10,999	55	2.49	4.85
11,000 - 11,499	56	2.54	7.39
11,500 - 11,999	61	2.76	10.15
12,000 - 12,499	84	3.80	13.95
12,500 - 12,999	101	4.57	18.52
13,000 - 13,499	111	5.03	23.55
13,500 - 13,999	119	5.39	28.94
14,000 - 14,499	149	6.75	35.69
14,500 - 14,999	207	9.38	45.07
15,000 - 15,499	149	6.75	51.82
15,500 - 15,999	139	6.30	58.12
16,000 - 16,499	161	7.29	65.41
16,500 - 16,999	165	7.47	72.88
17,000 - 17,499	139	6.30	79.18
17,500 - 17,999	112	5.07	84.25
18,000 - 18,499	124	5.62	89.87
18,500 - 18,999	100	4.53	94.40
19,000 & ABOVE	124	5.62	100.00
SYSTEM TOTAL	2208	100.00%	100.00%

SOURCE: SBCCE MIS-6 PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL REPORT, ACADEMIC YEAR, 1975-76

8. Ratio of Full-Time to Part-Time Faculty

Exhibit 3 illustrates the number of full-time and part-time faculty at the community colleges:

Exhibit 3

Full-Time Equivalent Faculty*
by Employment Status

(Fall Quarters 1970-1975)

Employment Status	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
Full-Time	NA	69.92%	62.75%	61.62%	61.01%	61.82%
Part-Time	NA	30.08%	37.25%	38.28%	38.99%	38.18%

* District instruction only - does not include "supervision." Does not include those classified as paraprofessionals, contracted or contributed effort (volunteers). All fund sources included.

B. PLANNING FOR FACULTY UTILIZATION

1. Introduction

The planning function is the foundation upon which good management relies to assure that expenditure of resources will be made in an efficient and economical manner while contributing to the effective achievement of legislative intent and the goals and objectives of the system.

The system level planning function should consist of three major activities: (1) development of time-phased quantified objectives established for the purpose of assuring that the system's programs are directed toward realization of established goals*; (2) development and documentation of a plan including a system of controls that will provide an efficient and effective means by which achievement of the established objectives may be realized; and (3) development of a set of performance standards that will provide a basis for measuring the degree of success achieved through implementation of the plan.

Examination of the planning function as it relates to the utilization of faculty includes a review of plans that have or should have been developed as a means of achieving economical, efficient and effective utilization of the faculty as a resource within the Community College System.

---

* A goal is defined as a desired state of affairs based upon current knowledge and values. An objective is defined as a desired quantifiable achievement with a specific time frame and which will contribute toward attainment of a goal.

Of specific concern to the auditor was evidence that the system has (1) documented program goals; (2) documented faculty utilization related objectives; (3) a plan and viable control system for achieving these objectives; (4) performance standards so that a determination can be made as to whether or not planned faculty utilization objectives are being achieved; (5) policies and procedures designed to guide and assist the various levels of management in achieving the system's planned level of faculty utilization; and (6) a reporting system that would compare planned with actual faculty utilization.

2. Legislative Intent

One of the purposes of the Community College Act of 1967 was to create a system of community colleges that would:

> *"Provide administration by State and Local Boards which will avoid unnecessary duplication of facilities or programs; and which will encourage efficiency in operation and creativity and imagination in education, training and service to meet the needs of the community and students."* (Emphasis supplied)

The above section from the Community College Act of 1967 clearly states that it is the intent of the Legislature that the administrators of the Community College System promote efficiency and innovation in the operation of the community colleges. Also, it appears that the responsibility for effecting efficiency and innovation was intended to be shared by both the State Board and the local boards.

3. Findings

a. Goals and Objectives Relating to Efficient and Effective Instruction Have Been Documented

In response to the requirement imposed by the Community College Act of 1967 that the State Board for Community College Education should develop a comprehensive master plan for the development of the community college education, the State Board prepared the "Design for Excellence." This document delineated the goals of the Community College System, including the task of making instruction more effective and efficient:

> *"Develop and employ innovative and imaginative approaches to instruction, which will provide more efficient and effective learning by adapting to the needs, capabilities and motivations of the individual."*

Subsequent to the development of the "Design for Excellence," the State Board prepared its six-year plan. The six-year plan was to be a plan of objectives, programs and financing community college education in the State of Washington for 1971-1977. The six-year plan also included the goal relating to instructional innovation. Included in the six-year plan are specific objectives that relate to the goal of innovation. These objectives are:

1. *To develop through student and faculty participation a process for identifying and measuring instructional effectiveness on every campus.*
2. *To increase the special appropriation for research development and evaluation projects.*

3. *To increase the number of student enrolled courses taught through alternative instructional technologies.*
4. *To increase the number of students achieving college credit by other traditional means.*
5. *To increase the number of courses using one or more techniques developed or introduced through projects and special systems appropriation or research development evaluation.*
6. *To increase the dollar value of outside grants for district research development and evaluation projects.*

In the 1971 annual Report To The Governor, the goal of innovation carried these following objectives:

1. *To adopt a systems approach to development and evaluation and instructional objectives and methods.*
2. *To provide consultation services, workshops and other in-service activities to assist faculty and administrators in the improvement of instruction throughout the system.*
3. *To support (1) institutional research to better identify educational needs and evaluate performance and meeting them; and (2) social efforts to improve instructional effectiveness and efficiency.*
4. *To offer educational programs on a continuous enrollment basis with individually placed instruction and convert suitable programs to subject basis as quickly as possible. To utilize modern technology and methods*

in developing libraries and centers for instructional simulation, individual study through multi-media and resources for the support of innovative and imaginative instruction.

b. Program Plans Have Been Established

One of the tasks required for the formulation of the six-year plan was to establish a program for achieving each objective. An interim report to the State Board that was presented November 19, 1971, cited programs that, if implemented, would result in the achievement of these objectives.

This document cited 57 specific activities that were purported to contribute to the meeting of the related innovation objectives.

c. Performance Standards Have Not Been Established

As of yet performance standards measuring instructional efficiency or effectiveness have not been identified or established. In September 1975, the consulting firm of Arthur Young and Company was hired by the State Board to establish standards of efficiency for the entire Community College System. Included in their scope of work was the task of establishing standards for the instructional program. The consultant recommended that instructional standards should be established through policy because the data available cannot support any other type of standard. The Legislative Budget Committee staff concurred with the consultant's recommendation; however, the reason for staff concurrence with the consultant's recommendation regarding instructional performance standards was that not enough was known about instructional effectiveness and efficiency to be able to recommend standards at this time.

d. Organization Structure and Responsibility Assignments Are Decentralized

One of the tasks outlined in the six-year planning process was the assignment of responsibilities for the achievement of the System's objectives. The assignment of responsibilities within the System relative to the goal to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of instruction has never been clearly documented. However, the State Board has apparently assumed the role of advisor and monitor. The local boards seem to have assumed the major responsibility of assuring that the plan will actually be carried out.

e. Policy and Assignment of Responsibilities Have Not Been Formally Communicated to Local Boards

The State Board has published a "Standard Policy and Procedures Manual" delineating the Rules and Regulations Governing Washington Community Colleges. While the rules and regulations speak to the development of new occupational programs and other instructional matters, no specific mention is made that it is the policy of the Community College System to increase instructional efficiency and effectiveness. Nor do the rules and regulations delineate the specific responsibilities of the State Board or local boards in assuring that the System's policy is being carried out.

4. Conclusions

The legislative intent regarding the efficient operations of the Community College System is quite clear. To carry out the intent of the Legislature, the Community College System, through its "Design for Excellence" and its six-year plan, has gone to great lengths to

communicate its desire to comply with the intent of the Legislature.

After reviewing the goal to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of instruction and related objectives, it is the auditor's opinion that they form a basis for a sound management plan. Although instructional performance standards have yet to be established, one of the objectives that is cited in the plan is the development of a process for identifying and measuring instructional effectiveness. This would be the first step in establishing standards for instruction.

Generally accepted management principles would dictate that the responsibility for carrying out a specific task should be assigned to a single management unit. In 1967, the Community College Act gave the general supervision and control of the System to the State Board. Logically, therefore, the State Board should have the responsibility for increasing the systemwide efficiency and effectiveness of instruction.

The State Board has apparently delegated the bulk of this responsibility to the local boards. This decentralization of responsibility would be a valid alternative if the following conditions are met:

1) A general policy statement must be made by the State Board to the effect that it is the intent of the Community College System to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of instruction, and that the responsibility for assuring that the intent is carried out has been delegated to the local boards;
2) The State Board must set quantified systemwide objectives that are reflective of the systemwide goal of increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of instruction; and

3) The State Board must employ a mechanism to assure that the actual performance of the System is meeting its stated objectives; and, if not, why.

It is the auditor's opinion that conditions one and three are not being met.

It should not be construed that individual community colleges have failed to take the initiative to improve efficiency and effectiveness of their instructional programs. In fact, several of the six sample colleges displayed a dedicated commitment to improve their instructional programs both from the standpoint of efficiency and effectiveness. What the auditor failed to find was a systemwide coordinated effort to insure that the legislative intent regarding efficient operations was being carried out.

5. Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION 1

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education, along with the 22 community college districts, review the System's current goal and objectives relating to instructional efficiency and effectiveness to assure that the (1) current goal is consistent with the intent of the Community College Act of 1967, and (2) the current objectives are really the end result that the System wishes to achieve.

RECOMMENDATION 2

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education, along with the 22 community college districts, review the System's current program plans and activities to assure they will continue to result in the achievement of the stated objectives.

RECOMMENDATION 3

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education, along with the 22 community college districts, initiate the appropriate activities to develop a process for identifying and measuring instructional effectiveness within the System.

RECOMMENDATION 4

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education publish in its Rules and Regulations (1) a general policy statement that expresses the intent of the Community College System to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of instruction, and (2) a statement that delineates the specific responsibilities of both the State Board and the local boards in carrying out their stated policy.

C. ACTUAL FACULTY UTILIZATION

This section of the report examines the actual degree of faculty utilization that was achieved during the 1974-75 academic year. Rather than reviewing faculty utilization data for the entire community college system, six individual community colleges were selected for a detailed review. The six colleges were selected on the basis that they represented the various types (e.g., rural, urban, etc.) of colleges making up the System. The six colleges were: Green River, Lower Columbia, Olympic, Seattle Central, Spokane Falls, and Walla Walla.

Two procedures were employed by the auditor to determine the degree of faculty utilization achieved by the six colleges during the 1974-75 academic year. The first procedure was to examine individual faculty member's teaching load. The second procedure was to review the course offerings of the six colleges.

1. Faculty Teaching Loads

Faculty teaching loads are determined locally by the district boards and are usually a subject for collective bargaining with the faculties. The negotiated teaching load standards are often cited in the written agreement between the local boards and their respective faculties. The extensiveness of the standards was found to vary from district to district. In some districts the contracts stated explicitly the teaching loads for faculty members and recognized varying disciplines and instructional modes. In several districts the contracts did not specify a teaching load. The union contracts at Green River, Seattle Central and Olympic Community Colleges specified in detail the teaching loads of their faculty members. The union agreements of Spokane Falls, Walla Walla and Lower Columbia Community Colleges did not specify teaching loads.

The teaching load standards contained in the various union contracts uses 15 contact hours per quarter as a base. This is comparable to the contact hour standard cited in a legislative proviso contained in the 1971-73 appropriation act mandating a 15 contact hour teaching load for community college faculties. The 15 contact hour standard is normally applied to faculty teaching lecture/discussion-type of course. The teaching loads of faculty teaching laboratory and shop-type of courses range from 18 to 35 contact hours.

The maximum teaching load that individual faculty members can sustain over a long period of time and not destroy the quality of instruction has yet to be defined and probably never will be since the optimum teaching efficiency will vary with the individual. However, use of a 15 contact hour standard is much like the concept of a 40-hour week. The optimum number of hours that an individual can work is also an individual thing. The standard teaching load, just as the 40-hour standard work week, then comes to be judgmental and a matter of policy.

In reviewing the 144 faculty members' teaching loads, the auditor could not find any instance where the assumed teaching load was either below the load specified in the contract or, in those cases where the colleges did not have a contract, that the teaching loads were unreasonable when compared to those colleges that did have contracts. It was also noted that a number of faculty members have taken on independent study students in addition to their normal loads. This was done without additional compensation.

Since the sample was selected on a random basis, the following statistical inference can be made:

We are 95 percent confident that during the 1974-75 academic year at least 98.2 percent of the faculty members of the Green River, Spokane Falls, Walla Walla, Lower Columbia, Seattle Central and Olympic Community Colleges were either teaching a load that was equal or exceeds the teaching load as specified by their appropriate contracts; or in those cases where the contracts do not specify teaching loads, the loads were reasonable when compared to those schools that do have specific workload standards.

2. Review of Course Offerings

A review of the course sections offered during the 1974-75 year by the six sample campuses was made. In this review we examined those sections with enrollment of less than ten and those courses that were offered more than once during the quarter or academic year. The purpose of the review was to determine if the classes could have been eliminated because of low enrollment, or offered less frequently or consolidated with other sections of the same course.

The results of the examination were that a relatively insignificant number of sections could have been eliminated. For example, during the 1974-75 academic year, Olympic Community College offered approximately 3,000 course sections. Of this amount, 24 class sections could have been eliminated, only 0.8 percent of the total offering. Lower Columbia had an offering of approximately 2,000 course sections, of which 57, or only 2.8 percent, could have been eliminated. Out of approximately 1,800 sections at Walla Walla Community College, only 14, or 0.8 percent, could have been eliminated.

Based upon the review of the course offerings of the six colleges, it is the auditor's opinion that the number of sections that were found that could have been eliminated were not excessive.

3. Position Control

The 1975-77 Appropriation Act set the maximum faculty staffing levels for the 1975-77 biennium through the inclusion of the following proviso:

> *"No community college may increase their 1974-75 FTE faculty positions to a level which is higher than that supported by the percent of formula funded in the appropriations made in Section 90 of this act."*

The percent of formula funded by the appropriation is at 72 percent. In terms of formula percentage, the faculty staffing percentage has decreased from 74.39 percent for 1974-75 to 68.75 percent in 1975-76. Exhibit 3 indicates the change in student faculty ratios from the 1974-75 academic year to the 1975-76 academic year. Both the changes in the student/faculty ratios, as well as the changes in the percent of formula for faculty staffing, indicate that the Community College System has increased its instructional efficiency. Whether or not this increase in instructional efficiency was a direct result of the position control provided by the appropriation bill is a matter for conjecture. Two other factors that may have contributed to this increase in instructional efficiency: (1) the limitation of transfers from one appropriation item to another appropriation item, or (2) the fact that actual enrollments exceeded budgeted enrollments.

Exhibit 4

Washington State Community College Student/ Faculty Ratios by College by Discipline Category Stated in Full-Time Equivalents For the 1974-75 and 1975-76 Academic Years

COLLEGE	STUDENT/FACULTY RATIO					
	ACADEMIC		VOCATIONAL		COMBINED	
	1974 1975	1975 1976	1974 1975	1975 1976	1974 1975	1975 1976
Peninsula	19.09	20.30	19.04	20.70	19.06	20.49
Grays Harbor	20.62	21.65	23.05	25.37	21.50	23.10
Olympic	19.55	18.05	17.59	20.43	18.67	18.93
Skagit Valley	20.46	23.54	17.45	19.30	18.99	21.50
Everett	23.02	25.94	17.37	18.61	20.21	22.34
Edmonds	24.53	28.13	20.66	22.93	22.51	25.43
Seattle Central	26.64	27.12	18.60	17.56	21.89	21.29
Seattle North	24.49	27.30	20.87	21.82	22.55	24.36
Seattle South	20.04	21.88	21.58	23.70	21.13	23.18
Shoreline	28.20	27.33	17.91	18.45	23.58	23.37
Bellevue	25.95	27.80	18.15	19.91	22.05	23.92
Highline	23.73	26.56	23.53	24.60	23.56	25.73
Green River	23.35	27.26	20.36	21.96	21.92	24.62
Fort Steilacoom	31.84	31.46	22.99	22.15	28.52	28.00
Centralia	22.18	23.53	19.35	21.89	21.06	22.89
OVCC			22.13	23.30	22.13	23.30
Lower Columbia	22.79	25.03	26.06	26.00	24.49	25.56
Clark	24.56	27.57	17.78	22.55	20.71	24.71
Wenatchee Valley	23.46	24.59	20.10	19.54	22.15	22.42
Yakima Valley	21.62	22.53	14.77	15.84	18.58	19.71
Spokane	26.06	29.08	23.18	23.25	25.57	24.07
Spokane Falls	22.71	24.11	22.98	20.11	22.83	22.15
Big Bend	17.83	19.78	18.04	19.90	17.94	19.84
Columbia Basin	20.37	22.84	19.10	23.21	19.62	23.05
Walla Walla	20.78	25.50	20.22	19.98	20.50	22.41
Whatcom	16.42	18.82	16.55	20.76	16.47	19 51
Tacoma	26.82	28.82	27.20	28.44	26.94	28.69
Entire System	23.76	25.40	20.22	21.25	21.96	23.27

NOTE: This exhibit displays the number of full-time equivalent students enrolled per one full-time equivalent faculty member during the 1974-75 and 1975-76 academic years by the various community colleges categorized by (1) academic courses, (2) vocational courses, and (3) a weighted average of both the academic and vocational courses.

4. Recommendation

RECOMMENDATION 5

It is recommended that the Legislature continue the practice of including in the appropriation bill the proviso that limits the number of faculty FTE's that can be employed within the Community College System.

D. MANAGEMENT REVIEW FUNCTION

1. Introduction

The management review function is concerned with the relating of planned results with actual results. Review may be defined simply as the process of determining that objectives, plans, policies, and standards are being achieved. Review presupposes that objectives, plans, policies and standards have been developed and communicated to those individuals having assigned responsibilities. Thus, effective control must rest upon a firm foundation of managerial planning. The review function, in the broad sense, involves the processes of:

a. evaluating performance;

b. comparing actual performance with objectives, plans, policies and standards;

c. analyzing the deviations from such objectives, plans, policies and standards;

d. taking corrective action as a result of the analysis;

e. following up to appraise the effectiveness of the corrective action; and

f. feeding information back to the planning process to improve future cycles.

There is a fundamental relationship between planning and review. Without effective planning there can be no effective review and, conversely, without effective review,planning is ineffective. The better planning is performed, the better management's chances are to obtain effective control. Thus, it is self-evident that management review cannot very easily be disassociated from planning.

2. Findings

Since the adoption of the Community College System's six-year plan, the State Board has attempted to report the System's progress in achieving its goals and objectives. This has been accomplished through the State Board's Annual Report to The Governor.

The first three annual reports contain statement of the System's goals and objectives as well as statements regarding systemwide achievements. The last two reports for the 1974 and 1975 academic year contain much less information concerning systemwide performance. The 1975 report contained only the following statement relative to the goal to increase efficiency and effectiveness of instruction:

> *"Goal IV - Develop efficient and effective learning approaches."*
>
> *A small increase was achieved in the number of college credits received through other than traditional means - challenge for credit, contracted studies, internship, etc. - but performance fell significantly short of the 1974 target.*

3. Evaluation and Conclusion

The 1974 and 1975 Report to The Governor fail to communicate whether or not the Community College System is actually increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of instruction. Although the auditor formed the opinion that the performance of the six sample colleges was adequate, no opinion could be rendered regarding the remaining 21 colleges because the State Board does not employ a

review procedure to determine if systemwide instructional efficiency and effectiveness is in fact increasing.

To ensure that the Community College System, in fact, is complying with the intent of the Community College Act, the State Board should employ a review process that is similar to the one described in the Introduction to the Management Review section.

4. Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION 6

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education, along with the 22 community college districts, develop a management review process relative to the increasing of instructional efficiency and effectiveness that will:

a. evaluate the System's performance;

b. compare actual performance with objectives, plans, policies and standards;

c. analyze the deviations from such objectives, plans, policies and standards;

d. take corrective action as a result of the analysis;

e. follow up to appraise the effectiveness of the corrective action; and

f. feed information back to the planning process to improve future cycles.

APPENDIX I

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS
AND COMPLETION DATES

	Assigned Completion Dates
RECOMMENDATION 1	12 months

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education, along with the 22 community college districts, review the System's current goal and objectives relating to instructional efficiency and effectiveness to assure that the (1) current goal is consistent with the intent of the Community College Act of 1967, and (2) the current objectives are really the end result that the System wishes to achieve.

RECOMMENDATION 2	12 months

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education, along with the 22 community college districts, review the System's current program plans and activities to assure they will continue to result in the achievement of the stated objectives.

RECOMMENDATION 3	12 months

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education, along with the 22 community college districts, initiate the appropriate activities to develop a process for identifying and measuring instructional effectiveness within the System.

Assigned Completion Dates

RECOMMENDATION 4 — 12 months

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education publish in its Rules and Regulations (1) a general policy statement that expresses the intent of the Community College System to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of instruction, and (2) a statement that delineates the specific responsibilities of both the State Board and the local boards in carrying out their stated policy.

RECOMMENDATION 5 — 1977 Legislative Session

It is recommended that the Legislature continue the practice of including in the appropriation bill the proviso that limits the number of faculty FTE's that can be employed within the Community College System.

RECOMMENDATION 6 — 12 months

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education, along with the 22 community college districts, develop a management review process relative to the increasing of instructional efficiency and effectiveness that will:

a. evaluate the System's performance;

b. compare actual performance with objectives, plans, policies and standards;

Assigned
Completion Dates

(Recommendation 6, continued)

c. analyze the deviations from such objectives, plans, policies and standards;

d. take corrective action as a result of the analysis;

e. follow up to appraise the effectiveness of the correction action; and

f. feed information back to the planning process to improve future cycles.

APPENDIX II

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

No proposed legislation is anticipated.

APPENDIX III

FISCAL IMPACT

No fiscal impact was developed for this audit.

APPENDIX IV

AGENCY COMMENTS

I. SUMMARY OF AGENCY COMMENTS

The following matrix classifies in summary form the response from the State Board for Community College Education to the recommendations resulting from the Performance Audit of the Faculty Utilization by the Community Colleges

Recommendation No.	SBCCE Response	Auditor's Recommendation
1	C*	NC*
2	C	NC
3	PC*	NC
4	C	NC
5	DNC*	NC
6	PC	NC

* Key:
- C = Concur
- PC = Partially Concur
- DNC = Do Not Concur
- NC = No Change

AUDITOR'S NOTE:

No changes to the original audit recommendations contained in the preliminary audit report, dated November 20, 1976, are proposed when the State Board for Community College Education has indicated "Partially Concur". It is felt that these recommendations do not require modification and can be implemented under existing statutory authority with available fiscal and overall manpower resources.

II. DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATION WHERE THE STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE INDICATED "DO NOT CONCUR"

A. AUDIT RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION 5

It is recommended that the Legislature continue the practice of including in the appropriation bill the proviso that limits the number of faculty FTE's that can be employed within the Community College System.

B. STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION RESPONSE

Do Not Concur

Until the objectives of a control on the number of instructional personnel is known, it is difficult to take a position on the merits of such a procedure. If the objective is to place a limit on the number of people to be served in the community colleges, it can certainly accomplish that purpose. The same effect can be achieved by imposing an outright statutory limit on community college enrollments. This is a policy issue which should be addressed directly.

On the other hand, if the object of position control is to avoid shifts of funds from other programs to instruction this can be accomplished by a reasonable statutory limit on transfers similar to that attached to the 1977-79 appropriation. However, both this limit and position control would not be necessary, since each does the same thing. As between the two, the restriction of resource transfer is by far the most manageable method and the one which is conducive to better management practices.

The biggest single objection to a fixed number of staff is that it discourages managerial efficiency. A district often has opportunity to meet a particular instructional need in its community and can do so by employment of part-time faculty who generally cost less than full-time personnel. Hence, the district has an opportunity to provide greater service for the same level of dollars, but to do so would result in a greater FTE faculty count. Position control militates against this greater efficiency in dollar use.

It is extremely difficult to satisfy the mechanic of position control in district planning. Position

authorizations relative to a given student population are a function of the mix of disciplines which students select, due to varying ratios among the disciplines. Only if students enroll in the exact numbers and disciplines for which program plans have been established, will the FTE faculty entitlement meet the position control requirements.

C. AUDITOR'S COMMENTS

The purpose of this recommendation is to fill the existing void in the accountability process between the Legislature and the Community College System. At the present time, the Community College System does not have available a method to assure the Legislature that its educational programs are being operated in an efficient and effective manner. It is this lack of an accountability process that concentrates on program efficiency and effectiveness that forces the Legislature to closely examine and control objects of expenditures such as number of faculty FTE's.

Since it is highly unlikely that the Community College System will propose an accountability system that concentrates upon program efficiency and effectiveness for the 1977-79 biennium, the Legislature must again focus its attention on how the system intends to expend its appropriation. Based upon the above comments, no change to Recommendation 5 is proposed.

RECEIVED
DEC 13 1976
LEGISLATIVE
BUDGET COMM.

STATE OF WASHINGTON

STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION

319 Seventh Avenue
Olympia, Washington 98504

December 10, 1976

TO: Thomas R. Hazzard, Legislative Auditor

FROM: John C. Mundt, Director
State Board for Community College Education

SUBJECT: Response to recommendation in the PERFORMANCE AUDIT OF FACULTY UTILIZATION BY THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

In responding to the recommendations of the above mentioned audit, I would like to make three general comments before commenting specifically on the recommendations. First, the report is helpful to the system as it gives visibility to several important management problems. Second, our response is tentative because we have not had time to review the preliminary report with critical groups within the system. In order to have time to review the report with the system, we requested a time extension from the legislative auditor. The request was respectfully denied. Inasmuch as the thrust of the audit is related to the plan which sets forth the goals and objectives for the system, it should be stated that the plan itself is a joint product prepared by the State Board and the districts. It is imperative that this audit be reviewed within the system and that the responses be concurred in by the districts because it is at that level that any recommendations must be implemented. Third, the report seems to assume that the State Board has a superordinate role relative to the districts. This operating thesis is not acceptable to the State Board. It is our assumption that the community colleges have an obligation to serve their communities and, therefore, absolute uniformity and conformity are not to be sought but rather to be avoided. We would request, therefore, additional time to discuss the recommendations with the districts and to seek either concurrence with the enclosed responses or to consider alternative responses more appropriate to districts.

RECOMMENDATION 1

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education, along with the 22 community college districts, review the System's current goal and objectives relating to instructional efficiency and effectiveness to assure that the (1) current goal is consistent with the intent of the Community College Act of 1967, and (2) the current objectives are really the end result that the System wishes to achieve.

POSITION: Concur

COMMENTS: This is done as a part of the planning process. Note, however, that the Senate Higher Education Committee has been reviewing the Community College Act by holding hearings throughout the state with trustees, students, professional personnel, and the general public.

These hearings raise an even more fundamental question: Are the purposes of the Community College Act of 1967 still valid?

RECOMMENDATION 2

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education, along with the 22 community college districts, review the System's current program plans and activities to assure they will continue to result in the achievement of the stated objectives.

POSITION: Concur

COMMENTS: This recommendation is inherent in any planning process. A plan as a product is to be viewed with concern whereas planning as a process is to be respected.

RECOMMENDATION 3

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education, along with the 22 community college districts, initiate the appropriate activities to develop a process for identifying and measuring instructional effectiveness within the System.

POSITION: Partially Concur

COMMENTS: It is logical for the state to expect that measures of effectiveness be established for instruction. However, there are a myriad of variables connected with any system for such measurement. Measurement is highly complicated in all instructional areas of higher education, especially so in a community college where an open door concept is maintained and where instructors have no opportunity to control most of the variables within their classrooms. Measurement can take place in some ways--those who find jobs successfully in vocational technical areas is one example; another is the success of students who transfer from community colleges to four year institutions. These latter elements we do concur need to be observed and reported. The measurement or evaluation of an individual instructor is a much more difficult task.

In addition, one must be aware that any system of evaluation of instructional effectiveness has become a matter for negotiations under the professional negotiations statute. It is impossible, at the present time, to make any system-wide process and procedure no matter how objective it might be while faculty groups still have the right to negotiate such a system at the local level.

RECOMMENDATION 4

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education publish in its Rules and Regulations (1) a general policy statement that expresses the intent of the Community College System to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of instruction, and (2) a statement that delineates the specific responsibilities of both the State Board and the local boards in carrying out their stated policy.

RECOMMENDATION 4 (continued)

POSITION: Concur

COMMENTS: Part 1 of the recommendation can probably be accomplished without much difficulty. It is the intent of the SBCCE and each district to improve constantly its instructional effort. This should not mean, however, that improving efficiency means that we should expect faculty members to accept increasingly larger work loads. It is our position that the present work load represents a maximum limit.

Part 2 of the recommendation will be resolved within the system after thorough consultation with the districts. Delineation of the responsibilities of the SBCCE and the local districts has long been a difficult area. However, it is reasonable that to the extent we adopt objectives to improve instructional effort, we need to assign responsibility for its fulfillment.

RECOMMENDATION 5

It is recommended that the Legislature continue the practice of including in the appropriation bill the proviso that limits the number of faculty FTE's that can be employed within the Community College System.

POSITION: Do not concur

COMMENTS: Until the objectives of a control on the number of instructional personnel is known, it is difficult to take a position on the merits of such a procedure. If the objective is to place a limit on the number of people to be served in the community colleges, it can certainly accomplish that purpose. The same effect can be achieved by imposing an outright statutory limit on community college enrollments. This is a policy issue which should be addressed directly.

On the other hand, if the object of position control is to avoid shifts of funds from other programs to instruction this can be accomplished by a reasonable statutory limit on transfers similar to that attached to the 1977-79 appropriation. However, both this limit and position control would not be necessary, since each does the same thing. As between the two, the restriction of resource transfer is by far the most manageable method and the one which is conducive to better management practices.

The biggest single objection to a fixed number of staff is that it discourages managerial efficiency. A district often has opportunity to meet a particular instructional need in its community and can do so by employment of part time faculty who generally cost less than full time personnel. Hence, the district has an opportunity to provide greater service for the same level of dollars, but to do so would result in a greater FTE faculty count. Position control militates against this greater efficiency in dollar use.

It is extremely difficult to satisfy the mechanics of position control in district planning. Position authorizations relative to a given student population are a function of the mix of disciplines which students select, due to varying ratios among the disciplines. Only if students enroll in the exact numbers and disciplines for which program plans have been established, will the FTE faculty entitlement meet the position control requirements.

RECOMMENDATION 6

It is recommended that the State Board for Community College Education, along with the 22 community college districts, develop a management review process relative to the increasing of instructional efficiency and effectiveness that will:

a. evaluate the System's performance;

b. compare actual performance with objectives, plans, policies and standards;

c. analyze the deviations from such objectives, plans, policies and standards;

d. take corrective action as a result of the analysis;

e. follow up to appraise the effectiveness of the correction action; and

f. feed information back to the planning process to improve future cycles.

POSITION: Partially Concur

COMMENTS: The above recommendation appears to require the SBCCE to assume a controlling role--a role which the SBCCE has consistently avoided in order to preserve as much local autonomy as possible. Each of the districts does, according to its own policies and procedures, most of the tasks listed as sub-points. However, there has never been one uniform set of standards and procedures established by the SBCCE for all districts. Again, it must be emphasized that some of the points listed are regarded as job-related and, hence, are subject to the negotiation's process in each local district.

It would appear reasonable, that the SBCCE initiate discussion with each college district to ascertain to what extent each of the sub-points is being addressed, what negotiated agreements have been reached, and what plans are being made to address issues not now being handled. However, for the SBCCE to establish uniform policies and procedures for each of the points listed appears over-restrictive.

JCM/EFP:sw

FACTS ABOUT THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET COMMITTEE

The Legislative Budget Committee is composed of eight Senators and eight Representatives equally divided between the two major political parties. It provides performance audit and other research services to the Legislature and legislators as requested. These studies include reviews of: (1) the economy , efficiency and effectiveness of state programs and state agency operations; (2) whether appropriations have been expended in accordance with legislative intent; (3) general fund revenue forecasts; and (4) other topics which may be of legislative interest. The Committee reports directly to the Legislature, making recommendations for legislative consideration and action.

Chapter 170, Laws of 1971, 1st ex. sess. authorized the Committee to conduct management surveys and program reviews of state agencies. Chapter 197, Laws of 1973, 1st ex. sess. provides that management surveys undertaken shall include reviews of program goals and objectives of state agencies to determine conformity with legislative intent, and shall include comprehensive performance audits to ensure that agency programs are being conducted in accordance with legislative intent and program goals and objectives. These performance audits are intended to provide for legislative review, an objective analyses of the effectiveness and efficiency of agency management.

In 1973, the Legislature directed that notice of spending from unanticipated federal, state or local revenues in addition to appropriations be given to the Legislative Budget Committee. These notices are compiled by the Committee staff and summaries thereof presented to the Committee and such other legislative committees or legislative staff as may request such data. The 1974 Legislature also provided that the Legislative Budget Committee maintain a central file of personal services contracts for use in preparation of summary reports as directed by the Legislature.

During legislative sessions, members of the Committee staff may assist the Senate and House Ways and Means committees, other legislative committees, and legislators with explanations or presentation of performance audit findings and recommendations, and in other areas of staff expertise such as development of an independent legislative estimate of general fund revenue. In addition, a fiscal note repository is maintained during these sessions for easy reference by legislators and others interested in the fiscal impact of proposed bills.

The Committee meets on a monthly basis during the interim period between legislative sessions, or more regularly when circumstances indicate the desirability or necessity of additional meetings. The Executive Committee meets upon call of the Chairman.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 1 1 1977

50 CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES